ECCLESIA LAW

AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS OF BRANDON JOE WILLIAMS' LITIGATIONS

24th May 2026

The Phenomenon of Alternative Contractual Theory

The contemporary legal system is increasingly forced to navigate a subset of pseudo-legal frameworks designed to systematically evade commercial debt, tax obligations, and statutory oversight.[1] At the centre of this movement is Brandon Joe Williams, an alternative legal theorist, author, and founder of an advocacy organization known as "The Amnesty Coalition".[2] Operating entirely outside accepted doctrines of American contract and commercial law, Williams develops and markets educational courses—most notably his "Contract Killer" and "Amnesty Project" series—which claim to teach individuals how to legally sever what he frames as the "slave state" contract matrix created by birth certificates, Social Security cards, and standard commercial agreements.[4]

To maintain strict analytical precision, this individual must be clearly distinguished from several other professionals who share his name. These include a prominent commercial litigation partner at Holland & Knight [6], a FINRA-registered broker who was the subject of a settled private placement suitability dispute [7], and various private individuals involved in standard family court proceedings.[8] The subject of this analysis is the California-based alternative theorist who promotes the concept of "State National" status, common law advocacy, and the unilateral discharge of debts through highly idiosyncratic interpretations of the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC).[3]

Williams' litigation campaign is defined by an aggressive attempt to weaponize the rules of commercial law, federal civil procedure, and sovereign-citizen-adjacent ideologies against corporate creditors, financial institutions, and municipal agencies.[1] An empirical review of his dockets reveals a uniform progression: plaintiffs file complaints alleging breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, and civil rights violations, which are invariably met with motions to dismiss and ended by federal court dismissals, filing restrictions, and severe financial sanctions.[11] Mapping these dockets explains the precise legal mechanics of his "presentment" methodology and the systemic, structural reasons why these cases are universally defeated in court.[11]

The Anatomy of Presentment and the Vapor Money Doctrine

The legal theory promoted by Williams is built on a multi-tiered conceptual framework that fuses classic sovereign citizen myths with literalist interpretations of the UCC, banking regulations, and federal officer removal statutes.[1] The first pillar of this ideology is the division of the individual. Williams asserts that a physical, natural person is entirely separate from their legal name, which he frames as a corporate "strawman" or "public corporation" created by the state at birth.[5] To put this theory into practice, Williams executed a legal name change in California state court to separate his natural identity from the registered trademark and sole proprietorship designated as BRANDON JOE WILLIAMS®.[9] Identifying as a "white citizen

of California" or a "foreign national of the Amnesty Coalition," he claims to stand outside the jurisdiction of state and federal courts, asserting that he only acts as an attorney-in-fact on behalf of the registered trademark entity.[4]

The second pillar of his system is the "vapor money" or "unlawful money" theory of debt.[11] This doctrine argues that because the United States suspended the gold standard in 1933, the federal government and commercial banks are bankrupt and operate solely on credit.[11] Under this view, banks do not actually loan tangible assets from their vaults during mortgage or credit card transactions; instead, they "vaporize" credit into existence using the debtor's signature on a promissory note.[13] Because the bank did not provide physical value, Williams argues that the underlying loan agreement is fraudulent and void, or that the debtor's signature possesses the sovereign authority to "create currency".[13]

The third pillar is the mechanism of "presentment".[13] Williams teaches that under UCC Article 3, a debtor can issue an "unconditional tender of payment" by presenting alternative financial instruments to a creditor.[13] These instruments consist of customized promissory notes, modified IRS Form 1099-A documents, or monthly billing statements altered with handwritten "special indorsements" and signatures.[13] Under his reading of UCC § 3-603(b), if a creditor refuses to accept these non-standard instruments, the creditor has "refused without dishonor" a valid tender of payment, resulting in the immediate discharge of the underlying debt.[9] When creditors reject these presentments and continue collection efforts, Williams and his followers file federal lawsuits asserting claims of breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, and civil violations of federal peonage and anti-trafficking laws, arguing that forcing a debtor to perform labor to pay off an invalid debt constitutes a form of modern slavery.[13]

Comprehensive Comparative Analysis of Litigations

The following comparative table lists all cases directly associated with Brandon Joe Williams or litigated under his firm, detailing their jurisdictional context, pseudo-legal mechanism, and concrete outcomes.

ECCLESIA LAW

Case Title & Case Number	Venue & Jurisdiction	Core Subject Matter	Presentment & Legal Theory	Current Status & Judicial Outcome
Joey Kimbrough v. Snap-On Credit LLC (1:22-cv-01217) [9]	U.S. District Court, Southern District of Indiana [9]	Credit Reporting and Fair Credit Reporting Act (FCRA) [9]	Standard consumer law litigation; utilized by Williams as an external blueprint for credit dispute structuring.[9]	Case resolved in favor of the plaintiff prior to his association with Williams' platform.[9]
In re Brandon's Name Change (23STCP02865) [9]	Los Angeles County Superior Court, California [9]	Civil Name Change [9]	Legal name change executed to formally separate the natural person from the trademarked name BRANDON JOE WILLIAMS®.[9]	Petition granted by the court in 2023.[9]
Knapp et al. v. Compass Minnesota, LLC et al. (24-cv-00100-SRN-DTS) [14]	U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota [14]	Real Estate Sales Representation Contract [17]	Claimed that exclusive buyer representation contracts were "negotiable instruments" and "collateral securities" exchangeable for Federal Reserve Notes.[9]	Dismissed with prejudice; Plaintiffs sanctioned under Rule 11 and ordered to pay attorneys' fees; Affirmed on appeal.[14]
Knapp v. Wings Financial Credit Union (23-cv-03219-SRN-MJC) [19]	U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota [19]	Mortgage Debt Dispute [19]	Initial attempt to challenge mortgage debt through early-	Dismissed with prejudice on February 9, 2024, by

			stage sovereign-citizen-adjacent theories.[19]	Judge Susan Richard Nelson.[19]
Knapp v. Wings Credit Union (24-cv-00434-DWF-ECW) [13]	U.S. District Court, District of Minnesota [13]	Mortgage and HELOC Debt Discharge [13]	Tendered a self-created promissory note and monthly statements with "special indorsements" as payment under UCC § 3-603.[13]	Dismissed with prejudice; filing restrictions imposed; Affirmed on appeal by the Eighth Circuit.[20]
Hauschildt v. AgTexas Farm Credit Services (6:24-cv-00086-ADA-DTG) [22]	U.S. District Court, Western District of Texas [22]	Agricultural Loan Debt Discharge [9]	Claimed that the lender's interception of farm payments constituted peonage, slavery, and contract breach; attempted UCC discharge.[9]	Dismissed without prejudice on May 19, 2026, adopting the magistrate's report and recommendation.[22]
Brandon Joe Williams v. American Express Company et al. (2:24-cv-01631-MWF-PVC) [16]	U.S. District Court, Central District of California [16]	Credit Card Debt Discharge [16]	Attempted to discharge card debts using IRS 1099-A forms and signature-created currency under trademarked name.[11]	Dismissed with prejudice in its entirety; leave to amend denied.[11]
Brandon Joe Williams v. City of Glendale (Round 1) (2:24-cv-07039-HDV) [9]	U.S. District Court, Central District of California [9]	Municipal Utility Bill Discharge [9]	Tendered an original unconditional order to pay (bill/draft) to	Dismissed for lack of federal subject matter jurisdiction.[25]

			satisfy utility debt under the UCC.[9]	
Brandon Joe Williams v. United States Small Business Administration (2:24-cv-09553-RGK-SK / Appeal No. 25-1808) [12]	U.S. District Court, Central District of California / U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit [12]	Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) Voidance [12]	Discharged federal disaster loan via alternative UCC interpretations; challenged federal removal jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1442.[9]	Dismissed under sovereign immunity and failure to state a claim; Ninth Circuit affirmed.[12]
Brandon Joe Williams v. United States Small Business Administration (U.S. Supreme Court No. 25-1221) [15]	Supreme Court of the United States [15]	Writ of Certiorari [9]	Appealed federal removal and sovereign immunity, asserting California state court lacks "State court" definition under § 1442(d)(6).[9]	Petition for writ of certiorari docketed on April 27, 2026; response due May 27, 2026.[26]
Brandon Joe Williams v. City of Glendale (Round 2) (25PDSC01538) [9]	Los Angeles County Small Claims Court, California [9]	Utility Debt Dispute [9]	Filed action to compel utility to accept and process California Commercial Code 3-603(b) payments.[9]	Dismissed due to a lack of legally cognizable damages.[9]
Brandon Joe Williams v. City of Glendale (Round 3) (26NNCV00519) [9]	Los Angeles County Superior Court, Burbank Courthouse, California [9]	Utility Bill as Negotiable Instrument [9]	Argued municipal utility bills operate as negotiable instruments under the California	Pending; hearing on demurrer scheduled for May 29, 2026.[27]

			Commercial Code.[9]	

Detailed Case Analyses and Legal Trajectories

Joey Kimbrough's Credit Reporting Case

This litigation (1:22-cv-01217) represents an independent consumer law action brought under the Fair Credit Reporting Act against Snap-On Credit LLC.[9] Joey Kimbrough filed and won the lawsuit before establishing a working relationship with Williams.[9] Kimbrough successfully argued standard consumer credit violations, securing the removal of derogatory items from his credit history.[9] Although Williams had no role in the drafting or execution of this litigation, he actively hosts the case docket on his platform.[9] Williams presents it as a training guide for his followers, encouraging them to study its structure while noting that the case demonstrates how standard consumer protections can be leveraged before transition into alternative common law and UCC-based litigation.[9]

Brandon's Name Change Case

In 2023, before establishing his formal litigation firm, Williams petitioned the Los Angeles County Superior Court (Case No. 23STCP02865) for a legal name change.[9] The petition was executed shortly after Williams secured a federal trademark from the USPTO for his personal name.[9] Williams used the state court civil name change procedure as the foundation for his "entity-splitting" theory.[9] In retrospect, Williams has expressed that his understanding at the time of filing was limited.[9] He has stated that, under his current theories, he would have drafted the supporting affidavit to state that he was separating his natural self as a sovereign "white citizen of California/Indiana" from the trademarked sole proprietorship and corporate U.S. citizen designated as BRANDON JOE WILLIAMS®.[9] State courts routinely grant standard name changes as administrative matters, but Williams repurposed the court's order as proof of his status as a "foreign national" standing outside federal jurisdiction.[9]

Knapp et al. v. Compass Minnesota, LLC et al.

This case (24-cv-00100-SRN-DTS) marked the first major litigation where Williams acted as an attorney-in-fact on behalf of alternative legal litigants, Preston and Michelle Knapp.[9] The Knapps had hired real estate agent Daniel Hollerman and broker Compass Minnesota, LLC to assist in buying and selling properties.[17] When disputes arose, Williams asserted that the executed buyer representation agreements were "unclaimed negotiable instruments" and "collateral securities" released via blank indorsement.[9] Acting on Williams' instruction, the Knapps ordered the broker to exchange these agreements for Federal Reserve Notes under 12 U.S.C. § 412.[9]

When the defendants refused, Williams drafted a federal complaint alleging breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, and various civil rights violations.[17] District Judge Susan Richard Nelson dismissed the complaint with prejudice, holding that representation agreements do not contain an unconditional promise to pay a fixed sum of money and are not negotiable instruments or collateral securities under UCC Article 3.[17] Crucially, the court granted the defendants' motion for Rule 11 sanctions, ruling that the Knapps had knowingly asserted frivolous claims rooted in rejected sovereign citizen and "vapor money" conspiracy theories.[14] The court ordered the plaintiffs to pay the defendants' reasonable attorneys' fees and costs, a judgment that was affirmed on appeal by the Eighth Circuit.[14] Williams has since admitted that his initial approach suffered from a lack of clarity regarding the distinction between conditional and unconditional instruments, which led to the sanctions, and he used this case to develop his Article 3 "Contract Killer" course.[9]

Knapp v. Wings Credit Union / Wings Financial Credit Union

Following their initial defeat, the Knapps initiated a mortgage dispute against Wings Credit Union (No. 24-cv-00434-DWF-ECW), which followed a prior related dismissal of a similar mortgage dispute under case number 23-cv-03219 on February 9, 2024, by Judge Nelson.[13] In the 2024 action, Preston Knapp appointed Williams as his attorney-in-fact with the power to deposit, negotiate, and transfer securities.[13] Under this power, Williams sent "orders" to Wings Credit Union regarding Knapp's primary mortgage and HELOC.[13] These documents included a self-created promissory note, billing statements with handwritten "special indorsements," and a land patent.[9] Williams argued these represented an "unconditional tender of payment" under UCC § 3-603, which satisfied the loans.[13]

When Wings rejected the documents and continued billing, Knapp filed a federal complaint alleging breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, and civil violations of federal peonage, slavery, and human trafficking laws under Title 18.[13] On November 7, 2024, Judge Donovan W. Frank dismissed the complaint with prejudice, explicitly rejecting the "vapor money" theory as frivolous.[13] The court denied Knapp’s motions to strike and amend, granted Wings' motion for sanctions, and imposed permanent filing restrictions on Knapp to protect judicial resources.[20] On March 18, 2025, the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the dismissal and filing restrictions.[21]

Hauschildt v. AgTexas Farm Credit Services

Williams drafted a federal lawsuit (6:24-cv-00086-ADA-DTG) in the Western District of Texas for Henrik Hauschildt, a farmer in debt to AgTexas Farm Credit Services.[9] The lender intercepted Hauschildt's agricultural payments, deducted its debt service, and forwarded the remainder.[9] Williams asserted that this arrangement, coupled with the lender's rejection of alternative UCC discharge documents, constituted a breach of contract and civil peonage and human trafficking under 18 U.S.C. § 1595.[9]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

The litigation quickly expanded into a chaotic three-front legal battle involving the lender, Hauschildt, and his landlord, resulting in two state court cases and one federal case running at the same time.[9] Although a GiveSendGo campaign was established to support Hauschildt, he eventually became overwhelmed by the simultaneous cases and severed ties with Williams' firm.[9] Hauschildt did not pursue the federal case further, and on May 19, 2026, District Judge Alan D. Albright adopted the report and recommendation of Magistrate Judge Derek T. Gilliland, dismissing the lawsuit without prejudice.[22]

Brandon Joe Williams v. American Express Company

In early 2024, Williams filed an individual complaint in the Central District of California against American Express Company and American Express Kabbage, Inc. (AMEX), seeking $250 million in damages (Case No. 2:24-cv-01631-MWF-PVC).[16] The dispute arose after AMEX rejected Williams' attempts to pay his outstanding credit card debts using IRS 1099-A forms and signature-created currency, resulting in the closure of his credit accounts.[11] Williams' complaint asserted eleven causes of action, including breach of contract, federal civil rights violations, and forced labor.[11]

AMEX moved to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), which Williams attempted to strike due to alleged procedural violations under Local Rule 7-3.[11] AMEX countered that any failure to meet and confer was justified because Williams had threatened criminal prosecution during their initial conferences.[11] District Judge Michael W. Fitzgerald granted the motion to dismiss with prejudice and denied Williams leave to amend.[11] The court ruled that credit card accounts do not constitute negotiable instruments under UCC Article 3, that banks owe no fiduciary duty of care to borrowers, and that the federal criminal statutes cited by Williams did not establish private civil causes of action.[11]

Brandon Joe Williams v. City of Glendale (Round 1)

Williams initiated a multi-phase campaign against the City of Glendale, California, attempting to force the municipal utility provider to accept his alternative UCC payment instruments.[9] In Round 1 (Case No. 2:24-cv-07039), Williams filed a complaint in federal court alleging breach of contract and breach of fiduciary duties after Glendale refused to accept an "unconditional draft" as payment for his utility bills.[9]

On October 31, 2024, Judge Hernan D. Vera dismissed the action, ruling that utility billing disputes are governed by state contract law and that Williams failed to establish federal question or diversity jurisdiction.[25] Williams chose not to appeal, later noting that he had realized federal courts rely on the Code of the District of Columbia rather than the California Commercial Code for municipal disputes, and that establishing federal jurisdiction over local utility debts was virtually impossible.[9]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

Williams v. United States Small Business Administration

In September 2024, Williams filed a complaint in Los Angeles County Superior Court against the Small Business Administration (SBA), seeking to void a $2 million Economic Injury Disaster Loan (EIDL) he had received in May 2020.[12] Williams had previously sent a letter ordering the SBA to discharge the loan based on his alternative UCC interpretations.[12] The Department of Justice removed the case to federal court under the federal officer removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1).[12] Williams moved to remand, arguing that the California Superior Court is not a "State court" under 28 U.S.C. § 1442(d)(6) because that statutory definition only includes territories under exclusive federal jurisdiction.[9]

On December 30, 2024, District Judge R. Gary Klausner denied the remand and dismissed the case, observing that Williams' complaint relied on "unintelligible arguments commonly brought by sovereign citizens".[12] The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals (No. 25-1808) affirmed the dismissal on July 16, 2025, ruling that the SBA is protected by federal sovereign immunity.[9]

Case 12: SBA Writ of Certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court

Following the Ninth Circuit's affirmance, Williams prepared a petition for a writ of certiorari to the Supreme Court of the United States, which was docketed as No. 25-1221 on April 27, 2026.[15] In his petition, Williams presents several questions, including whether a government corporation can claim sovereign immunity when statutory text allows it to "sue and be sued," and whether removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1442 is proper when the originating court does not meet his definition of a "State court".[15]

Williams also challenges the Supreme Court Clerk's office and lower courts for removing the registered trademark symbol "®" and mentions of his sole proprietorship from the case captions, arguing that the court must recognize the distinction between his natural person and his sole proprietorship.[12] The Solicitor General's response to the petition is currently due on May 27, 2026.[26]

Case 11: Brandon Joe Williams v. City of Glendale (Round 2)

In an effort to establish a different legal path after his federal dismissal, Williams filed a small claims action against Glendale (Case No. 25PDSC01538).[9] He argued that Glendale's refusal to accept his alternative UCC tender of payment violated California Commercial Code § 3603(b).[9]

During the in-person hearing, the small claims judge expressed interest in Williams' legal research but ultimately dismissed the action due to a lack of cognizable financial damages.[9] After his request for the hearing's audio recording was denied due to a mechanical malfunction, Williams sent a formal letter to the city inviting them to shut off his utilities.[9] His goal was to force the city to create concrete, physical damages that would allow him to bypass the small claims court and file a full state court lawsuit.[9]

Case 13: Brandon Joe Williams v. City of Glendale (Round 3)

Following the utility dispute, Williams filed a formal complaint in Los Angeles County Superior Court, Burbank Courthouse (Case No. 26NNCV00519) on January 23, 2026.[9] In this state court action, Williams argues that municipal utility bills operate as negotiable instruments under the California Commercial Code and must be discharged upon the presentment of his signature-based payment instruments.[9]
Williams has prepared this case to serve as his primary vehicle for testing UCC Article 3 theories in California state courts, with the intention of appealing to the United States Supreme Court if necessary.[9] The City of Glendale has filed a demurrer, and the state court has scheduled a hearing on the demurrer for May 29, 2026, in Burbank.[27]

Analytical Breakdown of Why Williams Systematically Loses

Frivolous Classification of the "Vapor Money" Doctrine

The primary reason Williams' litigations fail is the universal refusal of both state and federal judiciaries to accept the "vapor money" doctrine or any related debt-discharge theories.[11] Under the pleading standards established by the Supreme Court in *Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly* and *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, a complaint must present factual allegations that make a legal claim plausible.[11]
Courts are legally required to ignore conclusory assertions, legal arguments presented as facts, and conspiracy theories.[11] Because the "vapor money" theory—which claims that banks do not loan real money and that private individuals can create currency with their signatures—is recognized as frivolous and nonsensical, judges routinely dismiss these complaints under Rule 12(b)(6) without proceeding to discovery or trial.[11]

Misapplication of UCC Article 3 and Commercial Contract Law

Williams' legal strategies depend on a fundamental misreading of the Uniform Commercial Code's scope and statutory definitions.[11] UCC Article 3 applies strictly to "negotiable instruments," which are defined under UCC § 3-104 as unconditional promises or orders to pay a fixed amount of money.[13]
Bilateral executory agreements, such as real estate buyer representation agreements, credit card terms of service, and municipal utility agreements, are not negotiable instruments.[11] They contain conditional obligations and require mutual performance.[13] Furthermore, UCC § 3-603(b), which addresses the discharge of debt when a tender of payment is refused, only applies to parties obligated on an existing negotiable instrument.[13] It does not allow a debtor to draft a private promissory note or write "special indorsements" on a monthly bill, force a creditor to accept it, and then declare the debt erased when the creditor rejects the document.[11]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

Absence of Private Rights of Action in Criminal Statutes

A recurrent drafting error in Williams' complaints is his reliance on federal criminal statutes to assert civil claims for damages.[13] His lawsuits frequently allege civil violations of federal criminal laws against peonage, slavery, human trafficking, and financial fraud under Title 18 of the United States Code.[13]

Under federal jurisprudence, criminal statutes do not automatically create a private right of action for civil litigants unless Congress has explicitly included such a remedy in the text of the statute.[16] Because the criminal statutes cited by Williams do not provide a private civil remedy, federal courts lack the statutory authority to grant relief, resulting in the immediate dismissal of those claims under Rule 12(b)(6).[16]

Sovereign Immunity of Federal Agencies

In his lawsuits against government entities like the Small Business Administration, Williams' arguments fail due to the doctrine of sovereign immunity.[9] The United States and its agencies cannot be sued without their express consent, which must be clearly waived by an Act of Congress.[31]

Williams' technical arguments—such as asserting that the SBA is a "person" or "public corporation" and therefore lacks sovereign immunity, or that California state courts do not meet the definition of a "State court" under 28 U.S.C. § 1442(d)(6)—are consistently rejected by federal courts.[12] Courts construe waivers of sovereign immunity narrowly and interpret federal removal statutes broadly to protect federal agencies from state-court litigation, neutralizing Williams' jurisdictional maneuvers.[12]

Rule 11 Sanctions and Filing Restrictions

To protect the integrity of the judicial system, courts have begun to actively penalize Williams' litigation tactics.[1] Because these lawsuits consume significant public resources, harass commercial defendants, and are often used to delay foreclosures or collections, judges classify them as bad-faith "paper terrorism".[1]

By awarding monetary sanctions, ordering plaintiffs to pay thousands of dollars in opposing attorneys' fees, and imposing permanent pre-filing review restrictions, the judiciary has made the pursuit of Williams' theories financially dangerous for his clients.[14] This systemic judicial pushback has led to significant client attrition and effectively blocks these theories from gaining a foothold in the legal system.[9]

Sociological and Systemic Implications

The litigations of Brandon Joe Williams provide a clear case study in the systemic friction between formal legal institutions and alternative contractual movements.[1] While Williams continues to market his downloadable forms and "Contract Killer" courses across social media, podcasts, and digital platforms, the court records show a uniform pattern of defeat.[1] The reliance on "entity splitting," "vapor money" theories,

and modified commercial presentments consistently leads to dismissed complaints, significant financial penalties, and civil filing bans.[11]

As Williams' petition for certiorari remains pending before the Supreme Court and his state court utility actions move toward demurrer hearings, the underlying legal realities remain unchanged.[26] The judicial system operates on established statutory, contractual, and constitutional doctrines that cannot be bypassed through literalist wordplay or the unilateral creation of private commercial rules.[1] Ultimately, Williams' litigations serve as a warning of the consequences of pseudo-legal advocacy, illustrating how alternative commercial theories are dismantled when subjected to formal judicial review.[11]

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

ECCLESIA LAW

Works cited

1. Sovereign Citizens: A Conversation with Dr. Christine Sarteschi | Program on Extremism, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://extremism.gwu.edu/sovereign-citizens-conversation-dr-christine-sarteschi
2. Far Out With Faust (FOWF) Podcast - YouTube Music, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://music.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLatstMDdtfxiCf1N9rjzzQR1s3A1slHQo
3. Brandon Joe Williams: Life, Liberty & No Taxes - Hey Human Podcast, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://heyhumanpodcast.com/?p=4713
4. Brandon Joe Williams | Revocation | Sovereign Series part 4 - YouTube Music, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://music.youtube.com/podcast/s9700NU3z2w
5. Common Law School: Escape the Free-Range Tax Slave Matrix Legally w/ Brandon Joe Williams - Apple Podcasts, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://podcasts.apple.com/ie/podcast/common-law-school-escape-the-free-range-tax-slave/id1121467751?i=1000649690432
6. Brandon J. Williams | Professionals - Holland & Knight, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.hklaw.com/en/professionals/w/williams-brandon-jeffrey
7. BRANDON JAMES WILLIAMS - FINRA, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://files.brokercheck.finra.org/individual/individual_5444821.pdf
8. Docket Report Results - Not an Official Document, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://chancerydata.shelbycountytn.gov/chweb/ck_public_qry_doct.cp_dktrpt_frames?backto=D&case_id=CH-19-1502&begin_date=&end_date=
9. Current and Previous Litigation — Williams and WILLIAMS Law Firm, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.williamsandwilliamslawfirm.com/current-and-previous-litigation
10. Ep 83: Taxation, US Citizenship & Escaping the Matrix with Brandon Joe Williams, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://podcasts.apple.com/au/podcast/ep-83-taxation-us-citizenship-escaping-the-matrix/id1544492743?i=1000651870550
11. Brandon Joe Williams v. American Express Company, 2:24-cv-01631 - Midpage, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://app.midpage.ai/document/brandon-joe-williams-v-american-1000405165368
12. Supreme Court of the United States, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/25/25-1221/405379/20260428072109652_20260428-070817-00001271-00003060.pdf
13. Knapp v. Wings Credit Union, No. 0:2024cv00434 - Document 35 (D. Minn. 2024), accessed on May 24, 2026, https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/minnesota/mndce/0:2024cv00434/213253/35/

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice

14. Knapp et al v. Compass Minnesota, LLC et al, No. 0:2024cv00100 - Document 71 (D. Minn. 2024), accessed on May 24, 2026, https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/minnesota/mndce/0:2024cv00100/212713/71/
15. Supreme Court of the United States, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/25/25-1221/405379/20260428072109056_20260428-070817-00001271-00003059.pdf
16. Brandon Joe Williams v. American Express Company, 2:24-cv-01631 - Midpage, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://app.midpage.ai/case/brandon-joe-williams-v-american-1000405165368
17. Knapp v. Compass Minn., LLC | 24-cv-00100 (SRN-DTS) - CaseMine, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.casemine.com/judgement/us/66613b7465621832147931ad
18. Top Rated Minneapolis, MN Consumer Law Attorney | Carl Christensen | Super Lawyers, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://profiles.superlawyers.com/minnesota/minneapolis/lawyer/carl-e-christensen/4d2816c0-d079-49c8-9d71-3ccb6957979a.html
19. 23-3219 - Knapp v. Wings Financial Credit Union - Content Details - USCOURTS-mnd-0_23-cv-03219-0 - GovInfo, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/USCOURTS-mnd-0_23-cv-03219/USCOURTS-mnd-0_23-cv-03219-0
20. Knapp v. Wings Credit Union (0:24-cv-00434), Minnesota District Court - PacerMonitor, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.pacermonitor.com/public/case/52308498/Knapp_v_Wings_Credit_Union
21. Preston Knapp v. Wings Credit Union, No. 24-3359 (8th Cir. 2025) - Justia Law, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://law.justia.com/cases/federal/appellate-courts/ca8/24-3359/24-3359-2025-03-18.html
22. HAUSCHILDT v. AGTEXAS FARM CREDIT SERVICES - Justia Dockets, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://docs.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/texas/txwdce/6:2024cv00086/1172775322/23
23. HAUSCHILDT v. AGTEXAS FARM CREDIT SERVICES 6:2024cv00086 - Justia Dockets, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://dockets.justia.com/docket/texas/txwdce/6:2024cv00086/1172775322
24. HAUSCHILDT v. AGTEXAS FARM CREDIT SERVICES (6:24-cv-00086), Texas Western District Court - PacerMonitor, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.pacermonitor.com/public/case/52350189/HAUSCHILDT_v_AGTEXAS_FARM_CREDIT_SERVICES

25. Brandon Joe Williams v. City of Glendale (2:24-cv-07039), California Central District Court, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.pacermonitor.com/public/case/54813179/Brandon_Joe_Williams_v_City_of_Glendale
26. Search - Supreme Court of the United States, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/25-1221.html
27. Case Calendar - Online Services - LA Court, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.lacourt.ca.gov/CivilCalendar/ui/CalendarCase.aspx?caseNumber=26NNCV00519
28. Brandon Joe Williams v. American Express Company et al 2:2024cv01631 - Justia Dockets, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://dockets.justia.com/docket/california/cacdce/2:2024cv01631/917096
29. Brandon Williams' solo run from his own half and accurate finish for Ipswich in their 4-2 win over Preston on Saturday : r/soccer - Reddit, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.reddit.com/r/soccer/comments/172yajm/brandon_williams_solo_run_from_his_own_half_and/
30. Brandon Joe Williams v. United States Small Business Administration - Justia Dockets, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://docs.justia.com/cases/federal/district-courts/california/cacdce/2:2024cv09553/947250/23

Williams V. United States | Federal Tax Litigation Attorneys, accessed on May 24, 2026, https://www.pktaxlaw.com/our-services/williams-vs-united-states/

Ecclesia Law is a trading style of **MLITR Research LLC**, Wyoming, USA.
Ecclesia Law operates exclusively under **Attorney-in-Fact mandates** granted by its clients through private powers of attorney, trust indentures, fiduciary appointments, and private contracting structures. Ecclesia Law acts as a **private legal agent**, not as a BAR-regulated public law practice